arXiv:0706.4446v2 [math.AP] 10 Jul 2007

AN OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM WITH VOLUME CONSTRAIN IN ORLICZ SPACES

SANDRA MARTÍNEZ

Abstract. We consider the optimization problem of minimizing $\int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|)\,dx$ in the class of functions $W^{1,G}(\Omega)$, with a constrain on the volume of $\{u>0\}$. The conditions on the function G allow for a different behavior at 0 and at ∞. We consider a penalization problem, and we prove that for small values of the penalization parameter, the constrained volume is attained. In this way we prove that every solution u is locally Lipschitz continuous and that the free boundary, $\partial\{u>0\}\cap\Omega$, is smooth.

Résumé. Nous considérons le problème d'optimisation de minimiser $\int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|)\,dx$ sur la classe des fonctions $W^{1,G}(\Omega)$, avec une restriction sur le volume de $\{u>0\}$. Les conditions sur la fonction G permettent un comportement différent en 0 et à línfini. Nous considérons un problème de pénalisation et nous prouvons que le volume fixé est atteint quand la valeur de la pénalisation est petite. De cette manière nous prouvons que toute solution u est localement Lipschitzienne et que la frontière libre $\partial\{u>0\}\cap\Omega$ est regulière.

1. Introduction

We begin with a few historical remarks. In the paper [1], Aguilera, Alt and Caffarelli study an optimal design problem with a volume constrain. The authors prove the regularity of minimizers by introducing a penalization term in the energy functional (the Dirichlet integral) and minimizing without the volume constrain.

The steps that they follow are the following. First, the authors observe that, for fixed values of the penalization parameter, the penalized functional is very similar to the one considered in the paper [3], then the regularity results for minimizers of the penalized problem follow almost without change as in [3]. Finally, they prove that for small values of the penalization parameter, the constrained volume is attained. In this way, all the regularity results apply to the solution of the optimal design problem.

This method has been applied to other problems with similar success. In [2, 9, 12, 18], where the differential equation satisfied by the minimizers is nondegenerate, uniformly elliptic and in [8], where the equation involved may be degenerate or singular elliptic, but it steals has the property of being homogeneous.

Key words and phrases. Optimal design problems, free boundaries, Orlicz spaces.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B65, 35J65, 35J20, 35P30, 35R35, 49K20.

Supported by ANPCyT PICT No. 03-13719 and 03-10608, UBA X052 and X066 and Fundación Antorchas 13900-5.

In this article we show that the same kind of results can be obtained if we study a problem such that the differential equation satisfied by the minimizers is nonlinear degenerate or singular elliptic, and possibly not homogeneous. More precisely, the operator here has the form $\mathcal{L}u = \operatorname{div}\left(g(|\nabla u|)\frac{\nabla u}{|\nabla u|}\right)$ where g satisfies the natural conditions introduced by Lieberman in [14]. These conditions generalize the so called natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva. In [14] the author studies the regularity of weak solutions to the equation

$$\mathcal{L}u = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Lieberman proves, that under these conditions, solutions of (1.1) are $C^{1,\beta}$.

The conditions imposed to g are the following,

$$0 < \delta \leq \frac{tg'(t)}{g(t)} \leq g_0 \quad \forall t > 0 \tag{1.2}$$

for certain constants δ and g_0. Observe that $\delta = g_0 = p-1$ when $g(t) = t^{p-1}$, and conversely, if $\delta = g_0$ then G is a power. For more examples of functions satisfying (1.2) see [15].

Condition (1.2) ensures that the equation (1.1) is equivalent to a uniformly elliptic equation in nondivergence form with ellipticity constants independent of the solution u on sets where $\nabla u \neq 0$. This condition does not imply any kind of homogeneity on the function G (the primitive of g) and moreover, it allows for a different behavior of the function g when $|\nabla u|$ is close to zero or infinity.

We give now, more precisely the description of the problem that we study,

Take Ω a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\varphi_0 \in W^{1,G}(\Omega)$, a Dirichlet datum, with $\varphi_0 \geq c_0 > 0$ in $\bar{A}$, where A is a nonempty relatively open subset of $\partial\Omega$ such that $A \cap \partial\Omega$ is C^2. Here $W^{1,G}(\Omega)$ is a Sobolev-Orlicz space (see Appendix A). Let

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha = \{u \in W^{1,G}(\Omega) \,/\, |\{u > 0\}| = \alpha,\, u = \varphi_0 \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

Our problem is to minimize $\mathcal{J}(u) = \int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|)\,dx$ in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$, with $g = G'$ satisfying (1.2).

One of the difficulties of these problems is to prove the regularity of the minimizers, since it is hard to make enough volume preserving perturbations without the previous knowledge of the regularity of $\partial\{u > 0\}$.

In order to solve our original problem in a way that allows us to perform non volume preserving perturbations we follow the idea of [1] and consider instead the following penalized problem: We let

$$\mathcal{K} = \{u \in W^{1,G}(\Omega) \,/\, u = \varphi_0 \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u) = \int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|)\,dx + F_\varepsilon(|\{u > 0\}|), \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$F_\varepsilon(s) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon(s-\alpha) & \text{if } s < \alpha \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(s-\alpha) & \text{if } s \geq \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Then, the penalized problem is

$$\text{Find } u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K} \quad \text{such that} \quad \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v). \tag{P_ε}$$

In order to prove the existence of minimizers we use some compact immersion theorems in Sobolev-Orlicz spaces, and the result follows easily by direct minimization. The regularity of the minimizers and of their free boundaries $\partial\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}$ follows by showing that any minimizer u_ε is a solution of the following free boundary problem,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \{u_\varepsilon > 0\} \cap \Omega, \\ u_\varepsilon = 0, \quad \dfrac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = \lambda_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial\{u_\varepsilon > 0\} \cap \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

in the sense that was defined in [15], where λ_ε is a positive constant. The properties of the definition of weak solution are not difficult to establish since the minimization problem studied in [15] is very similar to (P_ε). The only difference is that in (P_ε) the functional is linear in $|\{u > 0\}|$ and here the term F_ε is piecewise linear and zero in α. With these results we have that for almost $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}-$ every point, the free boundary is locally a $C^{1,\beta}$ surface (see Corollary 2.1 in [15]).

We also improve the regularity result for the case $N = 2$, for a subclass of functions satisfying (1.2). We prove, that in this case, the whole free boundary is regular. Full regularity of the free boundary in dimension 2 was prove in [1], [4] and in [5] if $2 - \delta \le p < \infty$ for a small $\delta > 0$. Also for the penalization problem in [12]. A similar result was proved by A. Petrosyan in dimension 3 for p close to 2 (see [17]).

As in [1], the reason why this penalization method is so useful is that there is no need to pass to the limit in the penalization parameter ε for which uniform, in ε, regularity estimates would be needed. In fact, we show that for small values of ε the right volume is already attained. This is, $|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}| = \alpha$ for ε small. This step is where the proof parts from previous work on similar problems, since here we may not have the homogeneity of the function g (see Lemma 3.3).

Finally, the fact that, for small ε, any minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ satisfies $|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}| = \alpha$ implies that any minimizer of our original optimization problem is also a minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ so that it is locally Lipschitz continuous with smooth free boundary.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we begin our analysis of problem (P_ε) for fixed ε. First we prove the existence of a minimizer, local Lipschitz regularity and nondegeneracy near the free boundary (Theorem 2.1) and we prove that minimizers are weak solutions of a free boundary problem as defined in [15] (Remark 2.1). Then we have that for almost $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}-$ every point, the free boundary is locally a $C^{1,\beta}$ surface (Corollary 2.1). We prove that, for the case $N = 2$, for a subclass of functions satisfying (1.2) their hole free boundary is regular (Corollary 2.2). In Section 3 we prove that for small values of ε we recover our original optimization problem.

We include at the end of the paper a couple of appendices where some results about Orlicz spaces, some properties of $\mathcal{L}-$subharmonic functions and blow up sequences are established.

2. The penalized problem

2.1. **Regularity of minimizers and their free boundaries.** We begin by discussing the existence of extremals and the regularity. We are going to give some properties of the minimizers. As the functional $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ is very similar to the one in [15], some of the proof of these properties follows as in [15]. In that cases we are only going to state the results and avoid any proof. Next, we prove that any minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ is a weak solution of (1.4), as was defined in [15]. Therefore we will have, by the results therein that the free boundary is smooth.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be bounded. Then there exists a solution to the problem (P_ε). Moreover, any such solution u_ε has the following properties:*

1. *u_ε is locally Lipschitz continuous in Ω, and for $D \subset\subset \Omega$ we have that, $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq C$ with $C = C(N, g_0, \delta, dist(\partial\Omega, D), \varepsilon)$.*
2. *$\mathcal{L}u_\varepsilon = 0$ in $\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}$.*
3. *There are constants $0 < c_{min} \leq C_{max}$, $\gamma \geq 1$, such that for balls $B_r(x) \subset D$ with $x \in \partial\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}$*
$$c_{min} \leq \frac{1}{r}\Big(\fint_{B_r(x)} u_\varepsilon^\gamma dx\Big)^{1/\gamma} \leq C_{max}$$
4. *For every $D \subset\subset \Omega$, there exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that for every $x \in D \cap \{u_\varepsilon > 0\}$,*
$$c\,\mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}) \leq u_\varepsilon(x) \leq C\,\mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}).$$
5. *For every $D \subset\subset \Omega$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for $x \in \partial\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}$ and $B_r(x) \subset D$,*
$$c \leq \frac{|B_r(x) \cap \{u_\varepsilon > 0\}|}{|B_r(x)|} \leq 1 - c.$$

The constants may depend on ε.

Proof. Observe that, if $A \leq B$ then $\varepsilon(B - A) \leq F_\varepsilon(B) - F_\varepsilon(A) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(B - A)$. Then the proof follows as in section 3, 4 and 5 in [15].

□

From now on we drop the subscript ε and denote by u instead of u_ε a solution to (P_ε).

Theorem 2.2 (Representation Theorem)**.** *Let $u \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε). Then,*

1. *$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(D \cap \partial\{u > 0\}) < \infty$ for every $D \subset\subset \Omega$.*
2. *There exists a Borel function q_u such that*
$$\mathcal{L}u = q_u\,\mathcal{H}^{N-1}\lfloor\partial\{u > 0\}.$$
3. *For $D \subset\subset \Omega$ there are constants $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ depending on N, Ω, D and ε such that for $B_r(x) \subset D$ and $x \in \partial\{u > 0\}$,*
$$c \leq q_u(x) \leq C, \quad c\,r^{N-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(B_r(x) \cap \partial\{u > 0\}) \leq C\,r^{N-1}.$$
4. *$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial\{u > 0\} \setminus \partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u > 0\}) = 0$.*

Proof. For the proof, see sections 6 and 7 in [15]. Observe that $D \cap \partial\{u > 0\}$ has finite perimeter, thus, the reduce boundary $\partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u > 0\}$ is defined as well as the measure theoretic normal $\nu(x)$ for $x \in \partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u > 0\}$ (see [7]). □

Lemma 2.1. *Let $x_0, x_1 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$ and $\rho_k \to 0^+$. For $i = 0, 1$ let $x_{i,k} \to x_i$ with $u(x_{i,k}) = 0$ such that $B_{\rho_k}(x_{i,k}) \subset \Omega$ and such that the blow-up sequence*
$$u_{i,k}(x) = \frac{1}{\rho_k} u(x_{i,k} + \rho_k x)$$
has a limit $u_i(x) = \lambda_i(x \cdot \nu_i)^-$, with $0 < \lambda_i < \infty$ and ν_i a unit vector. Then $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1$.

Proof. It follows as in [8] by using the results in Appendix C. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega \cap \partial\{u > 0\}$ and let*

$$\lambda = \lambda(x_0) := \limsup_{\substack{x \to x_0 \\ u(x)>0}} |\nabla u(x)|.$$

Then there exists sequences y_k, d_k and ν_k, ν such that $\nu_k \to \nu$ and the blow up sequence with respect to $B_{d_k}(y_k)$ has limit,

$$u_0(x) = \lambda(x \cdot \nu)^-.$$

Proof. It follows as in the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [8] by using the results in Appendix B and C. □

Lemma 2.3. *For $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$–a.e. $x_0 \in \partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u > 0\}$, there exist a sequence γ_n such that if u_n is the blow up sequence with respect to $B_{\gamma_n}(x_0)$ we have that,*

$$u_n \to \lambda^*(x \cdot \nu(x_0))^-$$

with $\nu(x_0)$ the outward unit normal to $\partial\{u > 0\}$ in the measure theoretic sense and $\lambda^* = g^{-1}(q_u(x_0))$.

Proof. Suppose that $\nu(x_0) = e_N$. As in Theorem 3.5 in [4] and Theorem 5.5 in [6] we can prove by using the boundary regularity of solutions of $\mathcal{L}v = 0$ (see [14]) that for $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}$–a.e. $x_0 \in \partial_{\mathrm{red}}\{u > 0\}$, the following fact holds. If we consider the blow up limit u_0 of u with respect to sequences of balls $B_{\rho_k}(x_0)$, $\rho_k \to 0$ we have that,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}u_0 = 0 & \text{in}\{x_N < 0\} \\ u_0 = 0, \quad g(|\nabla u_0|) = q_u(x_0) & \text{on}\{x_N = 0\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Therefore, $u_0(x) = \lambda^* x_N^- + o(|x|)$.

Take now $u_{0,j}$, a blow up sequence of u_0, with respect to balls $B_{\mu_j}(0)$, therefore

$$u_{0,j} \to u_{00} = \lambda^* x_N^-.$$

Now, we want to construct a blow up sequence of u_0 with limit u_{00}. Observe, that

$$\Big|\frac{1}{\rho_k \mu_j} u(x_0 + \rho_k \mu_j x) - u_{00}(x)\Big| \le \frac{1}{\mu_j}|u_k(\mu_j x) - u_0(\mu_j x)| + |u_{0,j}(x) - u_{00}(x)|,$$

and since $u_k \to u_0$ uniformly over compacts sets we have that for $j \ge j_n$, $|u_{0,j}(x) - u_{00}(x)| < 1/n$ and for $k \ge k_{j,n}$, $|u_k(\mu_j x) - u_0(\mu_j x)| < \mu_j/n$ if $|x| \le n$. We may suppose that $j_n \ge n$ and $k_{j,n} \ge n$. Taking $j = j_n$, $k = k_{j_n,n}$, and $\gamma_n = \rho_{k_{j_n,n}} \mu_{j_n}$. We have that $\gamma_n \to 0$ and $|u_{\gamma_n}(x) - u_{00}(x)| < 2/n$ in B_n. The result follows. □

Theorem 2.3. *Let $u \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε) and q_u the function in Theorem 2.2. Then there exists a constant λ_u such that*

$$\limsup_{\substack{x \to x_0 \\ u(x)>0}} |\nabla u(x)| = \lambda_u, \qquad \text{for every } x_0 \in \Omega \cap \partial\{u > 0\} \tag{2.2}$$

$$q_u(x_0) = g(\lambda_u), \qquad \mathcal{H}^{N-1} - a.e\ x_0 \in \Omega \cap \partial_{red}\{u > 0\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. It follows as in [12] by using Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and Theorem 2.2 (4). □

Now, we can prove the asymptotic development for minimizers,

Theorem 2.4. *For $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}-$a.e. point $x_0 \in \partial\{u>0\}$ belongs to $\partial_{red}\{u>0\}$ and*

$$u(x_0+x) = \lambda_u (x\cdot\nu(x_0))^- + o(|x|) \quad \textit{for} \quad x \to 0.$$

Proof. We can prossed as in the proof of Lemma 2.3 until arrive to equation (2.1). Now, as by Theorem 2.3 we have that $q_u(x_0) = g(\lambda_u)$ and $|\nabla u| \le \lambda_u$, we can use the same argument of Theorem 5.5 in [6] and conclude that $u_0(x) = \lambda_u x_N^-$. And as, the blow up sequence was arbitrary chosen, we have the desired result. □

Remark 2.1. Now we have, by properties (1), (2), (3) in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.4 that any minimizer satisfies all the properties of the definition of weak solution II in [15]. Therefore we have by Theorem 9.3 and Remark 9.2 in [15] and Theorem 2.2 (4) the following regularity result for the free boundary $\partial\{u>0\}$.

Corollary 2.1. *Let $u \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε). Then there exists a subset $A \subset \partial_{red}\{u>0\}$ with $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial_{red}\{u>0\}\setminus A) = 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in A$ there exists $r>0$ so that $B_r(x_0)\cap\partial\{u>0\}$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ surface. The remainder of the free boundary has $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}-$measure zero.*

2.2. **Full regularity for the case $N = 2$.** We will prove, that in dimension two, for a subclass of functions satisfying (1.2), their hole free boundary is a $C^{1,\beta}$ surface.

The class that we consider consists on those functions satisfying condition (1.2) and such that,

$$\text{There exist constants } t_0 > 0 \text{ and } k > 0 \text{ so that } g(t) \le kt \text{ for } t \le t_0. \tag{2.4}$$

Observe that this condition is satisfied for example, if $\delta \ge 1$ or when $g_0 \ge 1$ and there exists a constant C such that $\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{g(t)}{t^{g_0}} = C$.

In order to prove the full regularity, we first need the following two Lemmas, that hold for any dimension and for any δ and g_0,

Lemma 2.4. *Let $u \in \mathcal{K}$ be a local minimizer. Given $D \subset\subset \Omega$, there exist constants $C = C(N, D, \lambda_u)$, $r_0 = r_0(N, D) > 0$ and $\gamma = \gamma(N, D) > 0$ such that, if $x_0 \in D\cap\partial\{u>0\}$ and $r < r_0$, then*

$$\sup_{B_r(x_0)} |\nabla u| \le \lambda_u + Cr^\gamma.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 7.1 in [6] but here we make a little modification by using a result of [13]. This result allows us not having to add any new hypothesis to the function g.

Let $U_\rho = \big(G(|\nabla u|) - G(\lambda_u) - \rho\big)^+$ and $U_0 = \big(G(|\nabla u|) - G(\lambda_u)\big)^+$. By Theorem 2.3 we know that U_ρ vanishes in a neighborhood of the free boundary. Since $U_\rho > 0$ implies $G(|\nabla u|) > G(\lambda_u) + \rho$, the closure of $\{U_\rho > 0\}$ is contained in $\{G(|\nabla u|) > G(\lambda_u) + \rho/2\}$. The function u satisfies the linearized equation

$$Tu = b_{ij}(\nabla u) D_{ij} u = 0$$

where b_{ij} is defined in (B.1), and is β-elliptic in $\{G(|\nabla u|) > G(\lambda_u) + \rho/2\}$.

Let $v = G(|\nabla u|)$, by Lemma 1 in [13], we have that v satisfies,

$$Mv = D_i(b_{ij}(\nabla u) D_j v) \ge 0 \quad \text{in } \{G(|\nabla u|) > G(\lambda_u) + \rho/2\}.$$

Hence U_ρ satisfies

$$MU_\rho \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \{G(|\nabla u|) > G(\lambda_u) + \rho/2\}.$$

Extending the operator M with the uniformly elliptic divergence-form operator

$$\widetilde{M}w = D_i(\widetilde{b}_{ij}(x) D_j w) \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

with measurable coefficients such that

$$\widetilde{b}_{ij}(x) = b_{ij}(\nabla u) \quad \text{in } \{G(|\nabla u|) > G(\lambda_u) + \rho/2\},$$

we obtain

$$\widetilde{M}U_\rho \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

For any $r > 0$ set

$$h_\rho(r) = \sup_{B_r(x_0)} U_\rho, \qquad h_0(r) = \sup_{B_r(x_0)} U_0,$$

for any $r < r_0 = \operatorname{dist}(D, \partial\Omega)$ and $x_0 \in D \cap \partial\{u > 0\}$.

Then, $h_\rho(r) - U_\rho$ is a $\widetilde{M}$- supersolution in the ball $B_r(x_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h_\rho(r) - U_\rho \quad &\geq 0 && \text{in } B_r(x_0) \\ &= h_\rho(r) && \text{in } B_r(x_0) \cap \{u = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the weak Harnack inequality (see [10] Theorem 8.18) with $1 \leq p < N/(N-2)$, we get

$$\inf_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} \big(h_\rho(r) - U_\rho\big) \geq c r^{-N/p} \|h_\rho(r) - U_\rho\|_{L^p(B_r(x_0))} \geq c h_\rho(r),$$

since, by Theorem 2.1, $|B_r(x_0) \cap \{u = 0\}| \geq c r^N$. Taking now $\rho \to 0$ we obtain

$$\inf_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} \big(h_0(r) - U_0\big) \geq c h_0(r),$$

for some $0 < c < 1$, which is the same as

$$\sup_{B_{r/2}(x_0)} U_0 \leq (1 - c) h_0(r).$$

Therefore

$$h_0\left(\frac{r}{2}\right) \leq (1 - c) h_0(r),$$

from which it follows that $h_0(r) \leq C r^\gamma$ for some $C > 0$, $0 < \gamma < 1$. That is,

$$G(|\nabla u|) \leq G(\lambda_u) + C r^\gamma$$

and therefore

$$|\nabla u| \leq \lambda_u + C r^\gamma$$

and now the conclusion of the Theorem follows. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let x_1 be a regular free boundary point.*

Take

$$\tau_\rho(x) = \begin{cases} x + \rho^2 \phi\left(\dfrac{|x - x_1|}{\rho}\right) \nu_u(x_1) & \textit{for } x \in B_\rho(x_1), \\ x & \textit{elsewhere,} \end{cases}$$

where $\phi \in C_0^\infty(-1, 1)$ with $\phi'(0) = 0$.

Let

$$\delta = \rho^2 \int_{B_\rho(x_1)\cap\partial\{u>0\}} \phi\left(\frac{|x-x_1|}{\rho}\right) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}. \tag{2.5}$$

Take $v_\delta(x) = v_\rho(x) = u(\tau_\rho^{-1}(x))$, *then*

$$\int_{B_\rho(x_1)} (G(|\nabla v_\rho|) - G(|\nabla u|))\, dx = -l\rho^{N+1}\Phi(\lambda_u) + o(\rho^{N+1}), \tag{2.6}$$

where $l = \lim_{\rho\to 0} \frac{\delta}{\rho^{N+1}}$ *and* $\Phi(t) = g(t)t - G(t)$.

Proof. The proof follows the lines of Theorem 3.1 in [8]. □

In the following Lemma is where we need to impose condition (2.4).

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $\Phi(t) = g(t)t - G(t)$, *and* g *satisfying condition* (2.4). *Let* x_0 *be a free boundary point ,* $D \subset\subset \Omega$ *and* $B_\mu(x_0) \subset D$. *Take* $v = \max(u - t\eta, 0)$, *where* $t > 0$, $\eta \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, $\eta = 0$ *in* $\Omega \setminus B_{\mu(x_0)}$ *and* $|\nabla\eta| \le C/t$. *Therefore,*

$$\int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{u>0\}} (G(|\nabla v|) - G(|\nabla u|))\, dx \le \int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{0<u\le t\eta\}} \Phi(|\nabla u|)\, dx + C_0 t^2 \int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{u>t\eta\}} |\nabla\eta|^2\, dx,$$

for $C_0 = C_0(N, \delta, g_0, dist(\partial\Omega, D), \varepsilon, C)$.

Proof. The Lemma follows as in Theorem 4.3 in [4]. We only have to make the following observations. First, observe that $|\nabla u - t\nabla\eta| \le |\nabla u| + C \le C_1 + C$, where C_1 is the constant in Theorem 2.1 (1). On the other hand, if g satisfies (2.4), and if $F(s) = \frac{g(s)}{s}$ then for $0 \le s \le C_1 + C$, there exists a constant C_0 such that $F(s) \le C_0$. Therefore we have that $F(|\nabla u - t\nabla\eta|)$ is bounded by C_0. The rest of the proof follows as in [4]. □

Now, following ideas of [12], using Lemmas 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6, we prove, for $N = 2$ and g satisfying (2.4) the following,

Theorem 2.5. *Let* $N = 2$, g *satisfying* (2.4) *and* u *a minimizer, then for any ball* B_r *centered at the free boundary we have,*

$$⨍_{B_r\cap\{u>0\}} (\Phi(\lambda_u) - \Phi(|\nabla u|))^+ \to 0 \text{ when } r \to 0,$$

where $\Phi(t) = g(t)t - G(t)$.

Proof. Let $0 < r < \mu$, $t > 0$ and v_0 be the function defined in Lemma 2.6. By Theorem 2.1 $u \le Cr$ in $B_r(x_0)$, take $t = Cr$ and let $\delta_t = |\{0 < u \le t\eta\} \cap B_\mu(x_0)|$.

Now, let us take x_1 far from x_0 and such that $\partial\{u > 0\} \cap B_{r_1}(x_1)$ is regular, for r_1 small. Let ρ be such that (2.5) is satisfied for $\delta = \delta_t$, and consider $v_1 = v_{\delta_t}$ defined in $B_{r_1}(x_1)$ as in Lemma 2.5. Then, the function

$$v = \begin{cases} v_0 & \text{in } B_\mu(x_0) \\ v_1 & \text{in } B_{r_1}(x_1) \\ u & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

is admissible for our minimization problem and $|\{v>0\}| = |\{u>0\}|$. Therefore, by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u) &= \int_{B_\rho(x_0)} (G(|\nabla v|) - G(|\nabla u|))\,dx + \int_{B_{r_1}(x_1)} (G(|\nabla v|) - G(|\nabla u|))\,dx \\ &\le \int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{u\le t\eta\}} \Phi(|\nabla u|) + Ct^2 \int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{u>t\eta\}} |\nabla\eta|^2\,dx - l\rho^3\Phi(\lambda_u) + o(\rho^3).\end{aligned}$$

By definition of δ_t we have,

$$\int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{0<u\le t\eta\}} (\Phi(\lambda_u) - \Phi(|\nabla u|))\,dx \le Ct^2 \int_{B_\mu(x_0)\cap\{u>t\eta\}} |\nabla\eta|^2\,dx + o(\rho^3) + (\delta_t - l\rho^3)\Phi(\lambda_u).$$

Now choose

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\log(\mu/|x-x_0|)}{\log(\mu/r)} & \text{in } B_\mu(x_0)\setminus B_r(x_0), \\ 1 & \text{in } B_r(x_0) \\ 0 & \text{in } \Omega\setminus B_\mu(x_0), \end{cases}$$

observe that the condition $|\nabla\eta| \le C/t$ is satisfied if we choose $\mu \ge 2r$.

By our election of t and η we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r(x_0)\cap\{u>0\}} (\Phi(\lambda_u) - \Phi(|\nabla u|))^+\,dx \le \int_{B_\mu(x_0)} (\Phi(|\nabla u|) - \Phi(\lambda_u))^+\,dx + \frac{Cr^2}{\log(\mu/r)} \\ + o(\rho^3) + (\delta_t - l\rho^3)\Phi(\lambda_u).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4, we have that $\Phi(|\nabla u|) - \Phi(\lambda_u) \le \Phi(\lambda_u + Cr^\gamma) - \Phi(\lambda_u) = \Phi'(\xi)Cr^\gamma$, for $\lambda_u \le \xi \le \lambda_u + Cr^\gamma$. As $\Phi'(t) = g'(t)t \le g_0 g(t)$, and as g is increasing we have that $\Phi'(\xi) \le g_0 g(\xi) \le g_0 g(\lambda_u + Cr^\gamma)$.

Therefore by definition of l we have

$$\fint_{B_r(x_0)\cap\{u>0\}} (\Phi(\lambda_u) - \Phi(|\nabla u|))^+\,dx \le C\Big(\frac{(\mu^{\gamma+2} + o(\rho^3))}{r^2} + \frac{1}{\log(\mu/r)}\Big),$$

where $C = C(\lambda_u)$. As by Theorem 2.1 (5), $\delta_t \le c\mu^2$ we have that $o(\rho^3) = o(\mu^2)$. Taking $r = \mu h(\mu)^\beta$, where $h(\mu) = \max\Big(\mu, \frac{o(\mu^2)}{\mu^2}\Big)$ with $\beta < \min\{\gamma/2, 1/2\}$, we have the desired result. □

Corollary 2.2. *Let $N = 2$, g satisfying* (2.4) *and $u \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε). Then $\partial\{u>0\}$ is a $C^{1,\beta}$ surface locally in Ω.*

Proof. The proof follows now as in [3], we give the proof here for the readers convenience. Let u_k be a blow up sequence converging to u_0. Since, $\nabla u_k \to \nabla u_0$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^N$, we conclude from Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.5 that $|\nabla u_0| = \lambda_u$ in $B_1 \cap \{u_0 > 0\}$, and then

$$0 = \mathcal{L}u_0 = div\Big(\frac{g(|\nabla u_0|)}{|\nabla u_0|}\nabla u_0\Big) = \frac{g(\lambda_\varepsilon)}{\lambda_u}\triangle u_0 \quad \text{in } \{u_0>0\}.$$

Therefore u_0 is harmonic in $\{u_0>0\}$, and if we take $v = |\nabla u_0|^2$, we have $0 = \triangle v = |D^2 u_0|^2$ and that means that ∇u_0 is constant in each connected component of this set. Therefore, by Lemma C.1 (6) and (8) we have,

$$u_0 = \lambda_u \max(x\cdot\nu_0, 0) + q\max(-x\cdot\nu_0, s),$$

for some ν_0 and $q, s \geq 0$. Since $\{u_0 = 0\}$ has positive density at the origin, we have that $s > 0$ or $q = 0$. Therefore, we have proved that any blow up sequence has a subsequences that converges to a half linear function $u_0 = \lambda_u \max(x \cdot \nu_0, 0)$ in some neighborhood of the origin, then applying Theorem 9.3 and Remark 9.2 in [15] we have the desired result. □

Remark 2.2. Since the functional in [15] is linear in $|\{u > 0\}|$ we can also prove, for minimizers of that problem, the full regularity of the free boundary when $N = 2$. We only have to use Theorem 2.4, Lemma 2.6 (to treat the first term of the functional) and finally the result follows as in [3].

3. BEHAVIOR OF THE MINIMIZER FOR SMALL ε.

In this section, since we want to analyze the dependence of the problem with respect to ε we will again denote by u_ε a solution to problem (P_ε).

To complete the analysis of the problem, we will now show that if ε is small enough, then

$$|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}| = \alpha.$$

To this end, we need to prove that the constant $\lambda_\varepsilon := \lambda_{u_\varepsilon}$ is bounded from above and below by positive constants independent of ε. We perform this task in a series of lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε). Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of ε such that*

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \leq C.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one in Theorem 3 in [1].

First we will prove that there exist $C, c > 0$, independent of ε, such that

$$c \leq |\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}| \leq C\varepsilon + \alpha.$$

Taking u_0 such that $|\{u_0 > 0\}| \leq \alpha$ we have that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_0) \leq C$ then we have that $F_\varepsilon(|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}|) \leq C$ thus obtaining the bound from above. We also have that $\int_\Omega G(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)$ is bounded. As $u_\varepsilon = \varphi_0$ in $\partial\Omega$, we have by Lemma A.3 that $\|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla\varphi_0\|_G \leq C$ and by Lemma A.4 we also have $\|u_\varepsilon - \varphi_0\|_G \leq C$, then $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,G}(\Omega)} \leq C$. Using the Sobolev trace Theorem, the Hölder inequality and the embedding Theorem A.1 we have, for $q < \delta + 1$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi_0^q \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} &\leq C|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}|^{\frac{\delta+1-q}{\delta+1}} \|u_\varepsilon\|^q_{W^{1,\delta+1}(\Omega)} \leq C|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}|^{\frac{\delta+1-q}{\delta+1}} \|u_\varepsilon\|^q_{W^{1,G}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}|^{\frac{\delta+1-q}{\delta+1}},\end{aligned}$$

and thus we obtain the bound from below.

The rest of the proof follows as in Lemma 3.1 in [8].

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε), $B_r \subset\subset \Omega$ and v a solution to*

$$\mathcal{L}v = 0 \quad \text{in } B_r, \qquad v = u_\varepsilon \quad \text{on } \partial B_r.$$

Then there exists a positive constant $\gamma = \gamma(\delta, g_0, N)$ such that

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla(u_\varepsilon - v)|^q \, dx \geq C|B_r \cap \{u_\varepsilon = 0\}| \left(\frac{1}{r} \left(\fint_{B_r} u_\varepsilon^\gamma \, dx \right)^{1/\gamma} \right)^q$$

for all $q \geq 1$ *and where* C *is a constant independent of* ε.

Proof. The proof follows the lines of Lemma 3.2 in [8]. The only difference here is that we have to use the weak Harnack inequality of [14] (Theorem 1.3) instead of the known one.

□

Without losing generality, from now on we will suppose that $g_0 \geq 1$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* u_ε *and* v *be as in Lemma 3.2, then if* r *is small enough (depending on* ε*) we have,*

$$\int_{B_r} (G(|\nabla u|) - G(|\nabla v|))\, dx \geq C \int_{B_r} |\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|^{g_0+1}\, dx \tag{3.1}$$

for some constant C *independent of* ε.

Proof. First we will use an inequality proved in [15] (see Theorem 2.3). Let,

$$A_1 = \{x \in B_r : |\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v| \leq 2|\nabla u_\varepsilon|\}, \quad A_2 = \{x \in B_r : |\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v| > 2|\nabla u_\varepsilon|\},$$

then $B_r = A_1 \cup A_2$ and we have that,

$$\int_{B_r} (G(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|) - G(|\nabla v|))\, dx \geq C\Big(\int_{A_2} G(|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|)\, dx + \int_{A_1} F(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|^2\, dx \Big). \tag{3.2}$$

Therefore we have, using that $g_0 \geq 1$ and (g1) in Lemma A.1, that when $|\nabla u_\varepsilon| \leq 1$ and $|\nabla v - \nabla u_\varepsilon| \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|) &\geq C|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|^{g_0+1} \\ F(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|) &\geq C|\nabla u_\varepsilon|^{g_0-1} \geq C|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|^{g_0-1} \quad \text{in } A_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1 and (2.2), we have that for small r (depending on ε), $|\nabla u_\varepsilon|$ is bounded by a constant independent of ε. By Lemma 5.1 in [14] we have that there exist $C_0, C_1 = C_0, C_1(N, g_0, \delta)$ such that,

$$\sup_{B_r} G(|\nabla v|) \leq \frac{C_0}{r^N} \int_{B_{2r}} G(|\nabla v|)\, dx \leq \frac{C_1}{r^N} \int_{B_{2r}} (1 + G(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|))\, dx \leq \bar{C},$$

if we choose r small (depending on ε) and where $\bar{C}$ is independent of ε. Then $|\nabla u_\varepsilon|$ and $|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla v|$ are bounded in B_r by a constant independent of ε. Therefore, (3.3) holds for all $x \in B_r$ and for a constant C (independent of ε). Combining (3.2) and (3.3) we obtain the desired result.

□

Lemma 3.4. *For every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists a neighborhood of* A *in* Ω *such that* $u_\varepsilon > 0$ *in this neighborhood.*

Proof. The proof follows the lines of the one in Lemma 3.4 in [8]. There is one step that it is convenient to mention here. When we use the Schwartz symmetrization, we have to use that this symmetrization preserves the distribution function and strictly decreases the functional $\int_B G(|\nabla u|)\, dx$, unless the function is already radially symmetric and radially decreasing. These facts holds by Corollary 2.35, in section II.8 of [11]. The rest of the proof follows without any change. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{K}$ be a solution to (P_ε), then*

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \geq c > 0,$$

where c is independent of ε

Proof. The proof follows as in [8] by using Lemmas 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and Lemma C.1 . □

With these uniform bounds on λ_ε, we can prove the desired result.

Theorem 3.1. *Under the same hypotheses of Lemma 3.5, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, $|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}| = \alpha$. Therefore, u_ε is a minimizer of $\mathcal{J}$ in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$.*

Proof. It follows as in Theorem 3.1 in [8] be using Lemmas 3.1 and 3.5. □

As a corollary, we have the desired result for our problem

Corollary 3.1. *Any minimizer u of $\mathcal{J}$ in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ is a locally Lipschitz continuous function, $\partial_{red}\{u > 0\}$ is a $C^{1,\beta}$ surface locally in Ω and the remainder of the free boundary has $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}-$measure zero. Moreover if $N = 2$ and g satisfies (2.4) then $\partial\{u > 0\}$ is a $C^{1,\beta}$ surface locally in Ω.*

Proof. If u is minimizer of $\mathcal{J}$ in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$, by Theorem 3.1 we have that for small ε there exists a solution u_ε to (P_ε) such that $|\{u_\varepsilon > 0\}| = \alpha$, then u is a solution to (P_ε), therefore the result follows. □

Acknowledgements. The authors want to thank Professor Noemi Wolanski for providing the proof of Lemma 2.3.

Appendix A. Properties of G and Orlicz spaces

The following results are all include in [15].

Lemma A.1. *The function g satisfies the following properties,*

(g1) $\min\{s^\delta, s^{g_0}\}g(t) \leq g(st) \leq \max\{s^\delta, s^{g_0}\}g(t)$
(g2) G *is convex and* C^2
(g3) $\dfrac{tg(t)}{1+g_0} \leq G(t) \leq tg(t) \quad \forall\ t \geq 0.$

Lemma A.2. *If $\widetilde{G}$ is such that $\widetilde{G}'(t) = g^{-1}(t)$ then,*

$$(\widetilde{G}1) \qquad \frac{(1+\delta)}{\delta}\min\{s^{1+1/\delta}, s^{1+1/g_0}\}\widetilde{G}(t) \leq \widetilde{G}(st) \leq \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\max\{s^{1+1/\delta}, s^{1+1/g_0}\}\widetilde{G}(t)$$

We recall that the functional

$$\|u\|_G = \inf\Big\{k > 0 : \int_\Omega G\Big(\frac{|u(x)|}{k}\Big)\,dx \leq 1\Big\}$$

is a norm in the Orlicz space $L_G(\Omega)$ which is the linear hull of the Orlicz class

$$K_G(\Omega) = \Big\{u \text{ measurable } : \int_\Omega G(|u|)\,dx < \infty\Big\},$$

observe that this set is convex, since G is also convex (property (g2)). The Orlicz-Sobolev space $W^{1,G}(\Omega)$ consists of those functions in $L^G(\Omega)$ whose distributional derivatives ∇u also belong to $L^G(\Omega)$. And we have that $\|u\|_{W^{1,G}} = \max\{\|u\|_G, \|\nabla u\|_G\}$ is a norm for this space.

Theorem A.1. *$L^G(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{1+\delta}(\Omega)$ continuously.*

Lemma A.3. *There exists a constant $C = C(g_0, \delta)$ such that,*

$$\|u\|_G \leq C \max\Big\{\Big(\int_\Omega G(|u|)\,dx\Big)^{1/(\delta+1)}, \Big(\int_\Omega G(|u|)\,dx\Big)^{1/(g_0+1)}\Big\}$$

Lemma A.4. *If $u \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ with $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|)\,dx$ is finite, then*

$$\int_\Omega G\Big(\frac{|u|}{R}\Big)\,dx \leq \int_\Omega G(|\nabla u|)\,dx \qquad \textit{for } R = \textit{diam}\,\Omega.$$

Appendix B. A result on $\mathcal{L}$-solutions functions with linear growth

In this section we will state some properties of $\mathcal{L}$-subsolutions. From now on, we note $B_r^+ = B_r(0) \cap \{x_N > 0\}$.

Remark B.1. When $|\nabla u| \geq c$, u satisfies a linear nondivergence uniformly elliptic equation, $Tu = 0$. In our case

$$Tv = b_{ij}(\nabla u) D_{ij} v = 0 \tag{B.1}$$

where

$$b_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \left(\frac{g'(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u|}{g(|\nabla u|)} - 1\right)\frac{D_i u D_j u}{|\nabla u|^2},$$

and the matrix $b_{ij}(\nabla u)$ is β-elliptic in $\{|\nabla u| > c\}$, where $\beta = \max\{\max\{g_0, 1\}, \max\{1, 1/\delta\}\}$.

Theorem B.1. *Let u be a Lipschitz function in $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that*

1. *$u \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathcal{L}u = 0$ in $\{u > 0\}$.*
2. *$\{x_N < 0\} \subset \{u > 0\}$, $u = 0$ in $\{x_N = 0\}$.*
3. *There exists $0 < \lambda_0 < 1$ such that $\dfrac{|\{u = 0\} \cap B_R(0)|}{|B_R(0)|} > \lambda_0$, $\forall R > 0$.*

Then $u = 0$ in $\{x_N > 0\}$.

Proof. See Appendix in [16]. □

Appendix C. Blow-up limits

Now we give the definition of blow-up sequence, and we collect some properties of the limits of these blow-up sequences for certain classes of functions that are used throughout the paper.

Let u be a function with the following properties,

(C1) u is Lipschitz in Ω with constant $L > 0$, $u \geq 0$ in Ω and $\mathcal{L}u = 0$ in $\Omega \cap \{u > 0\}$.

(C2) Given $0 < \kappa < 1$, there exist two positive constants C_κ and r_κ such that for every ball $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$ and $0 < r < r_\kappa$,

$$\frac{1}{r}\left(⨍_{B_r(x_0)} u^\gamma \, dx\right)^{1/\gamma} \leq C_\kappa \text{ implies that } u \equiv 0 \text{ in } B_{\kappa r}(x_0).$$

(C3) There exist constants $r_0 > 0$ and $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 < 1$ such that, for every ball $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega$ x_0 on $\partial\{u > 0\}$ and $0 < r < r_0$

$$\lambda_1 \leq \frac{|B_r(x_0) \cap \{u > 0\}|}{|B_r(x_0)|} \leq \lambda_2.$$

Definition C.1. *Let $B_{\rho_k}(x_k) \subset \Omega$ be a sequence of balls with $\rho_k \to 0$, $x_k \to x_0 \in \Omega$ and $u(x_k) = 0$. Let*

$$u_k(x) := \frac{1}{\rho_k} u(x_k + \rho_k x).$$

We call u_k a blow-up sequence with respect to $B_{\rho_k}(x_k)$.

Since u is locally Lipschitz continuous, there exists a blow-up limit $u_0 : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for a subsequence,

$$\begin{aligned} &u_k \to u_0 \quad \text{in} \quad C^\alpha_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{for every} \quad 0 < \alpha < 1, \\ &\nabla u_k \to \nabla u_0 \quad * - \text{weakly in} \quad L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N), \end{aligned}$$

and u_0 is Lipschitz in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with constant L.

Lemma C.1. *If u satisfies properties* (C1), (C2) *and* (C3) *then,*

1. *$u_0 \geq 0$ in Ω and $\mathcal{L}u_0 = 0$ in $\{u_0 > 0\}$*
2. *$\partial\{u_k > 0\} \to \partial\{u_0 > 0\}$ locally in Hausdorff distance,*
3. *$\chi_{\{u_k > 0\}} \to \chi_{\{u_0 > 0\}}$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$,*
4. *If $K \subset\subset \{u_0 = 0\}$, then $u_k = 0$ in K for big enough k,*
5. *If $K \subset\subset \{u_0 > 0\} \cup \{u_0 = 0\}^\circ$, then $\nabla u_k \to \nabla u_0$ uniformly in K,*
6. *There exists a constant $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that,*

$$\frac{|B_R(y_0) \cap \{u_0 = 0\}|}{|B_R(y_0)|} \geq \lambda, \quad \forall R > 0, \forall y_0 \in \partial\{u_0 > 0\}$$

7. *$\nabla u_k \to \nabla u_0$ a.e in $\mathbb{R}^N$,*
8. *If $x_k \in \partial\{u > 0\}$, then $0 \in \partial\{u_0 > 0\}$*

Proof. The proof follows as in [8] and [12]. □

References

[1] N. Aguilera, H. W. Alt, and L. A. Caffarelli, *An optimization problem with volume constraint*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **24** (1986), no. 2, 191–198.

[2] N. E. Aguilera, L. A. Caffarelli, and J. Spruck, *An optimization problem in heat conduction*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **14** (1987), no. 3, 355–387 (1988).

[3] H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli, *Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **325** (1981), 105–144.

[4] H. W. Alt, L. A. Caffarelli, and A. Friedman, *A free boundary problem for quasilinear elliptic equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **11** (1984), no. 1, 1–44.

[5] D. Danielli and A. Petrosyan, *Full regularity of the free boundary in a bernoulli-type problem in two dimensions*, to appear in Math. Res. Lett.

[6] ———, *A minimum problem with free boundary for a degenerate quasilinear operator*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **23** (2005), no. 1, 97–124.

[7] H. Federer, *Geometric measure theory*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1969.

[8] J. Fernández Bonder, S. Martínez, and N Wolanski, *An optimization problem with volume constrain for a degenerate quasilinear operator*, to appear in Jour. Diff. Eqs.

[9] J. Fernández Bonder, J.D. Rossi, and N. Wolanski, *Regularity of the free boundary in an optimization problem related to the best sobolev trace constant*, SIAM Jour. Control Opt. **44** (2005), no. 5, 1612–1635.

[10] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 224, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[11] B. Kawohl, *Rearrangements and convexity of level sets in pde*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1150, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

[12] C. Lederman, *A free boundary problem with a volume penalization*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **23** (1996), no. 2, 249–300.

[13] Gary M. Lieberman, *Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **12** (1988), no. 11, 1203–1219.

[14] ———, *The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural′tseva for elliptic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **16** (1991), no. 2-3, 311–361.

[15] S. Martínez and N. Wolanski, *A minimum problem with free boundary in orlicz spaces*, arXive math.AP/0602388.

[16] S. Martínez and N. Wolanski, *A singular perturbation problem for a quasilinear operator satisfying the natural growth conditions of lieberman*, in preparetion.

[17] A. Petrosyan, *On the full regularity of the free boundary in a class of variational problems*, preprint.

[18] Eduardo V. Teixeira, *The nonlinear optimization problem in heat conduction*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **24** (2005), no. 1, 21–46.

Departamento de Matemática, FCEyN
UBA (1428) Buenos Aires, Argentina.

E-mail address: `smartin@dm.uba.ar`